

**Accountability System for 2006 and Beyond - Standard Procedures**  
**Commissioner of Education Final Decisions**  
**April 2006**

**Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)**

1. Standards. The 2006 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 60% for Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies, 40% for Mathematics, and 35% for Science. These standards represent increases of 10 percentage points for Reading/ELA, Writing, Social Studies and Science, and 5 percentage points for Mathematics over the 2005 standards. The 2006 standards were announced in April 2005, subsequently published in the *2005 Accountability Manual*, and finalized in September 2005 by the commissioner.

For 2007, the *Academically Acceptable* standards increase by 5 percentage points for all subjects—to 65% for Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies; to 45% for Mathematics; and to 40% for Science. That same year, the standards for *Recognized* increase to 75% for all subjects.

In 2008, the *Academically Acceptable* standards increase by 5 percentage points for Mathematics and Science. In 2009, the *Academically Acceptable* standards increase by 5 percentage points for all subjects. In addition, in 2009, the *Recognized* standards increase to 80% for all subjects. In 2010, the *Academically Acceptable* standards increase by 5 percentage points for Mathematics and Science.

	<b>2006</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2009</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2010</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>R/ELA, W, SS</b>	<b>60 / 70 / 90</b>	<b>65 / 75 / 90</b>	65 / 75 / 90	<b>70 / 80 / 90</b>	70 / 80 / 90
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>40 / 70 / 90</b>	<b>45 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>50 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>55 / 80 / 90</b>	<b>60 / 80 / 90</b>
<b>Science</b>	<b>35 / 70 / 90</b>	<b>40 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>45 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>50 / 80 / 90</b>	<b>55 / 80 / 90</b>

*Rationale:* These increases acknowledge that more students need to be performing at higher levels sooner and gaps in achievement among the student groups need to be closed more rapidly. Gains of 5 percentage points per year represent a commitment on the part of educators to continuously improve.

The increase in the *Recognized* standard from 75% to 80% occurs in 2009; one year after the introduction of the grade 8 Science test in 2008. In addition, inclusion of TAKS-I results are recommended beginning in 2008.

The lower standards for Mathematics and Science reflect the lower performance in these subjects compared to Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies, and the greater gaps in performance among the student groups observed for these subjects. The state-acknowledged shortage of qualified Mathematics and Science teachers is cited as a factor affecting the ability of districts to meet increasing expectations in these two subject areas. Initially setting standards that reflect a starting point and phasing in higher standards over time continues the philosophy of the prior system which led to nationally recognized gains in performance of student groups that significantly closed the performance gaps.

The Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies standards are increased to 65% in 2007 rather than waiting until 2008 because state average performance and gains in performance in these subject areas support the higher standards. In 2008 when the system is becoming more rigorous for other reasons, such as the inclusion of TAKS-I and grade 8 Science results, districts and campuses will be able to focus on Mathematics and Science, while the Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies standards remain stable.

2. Commended Performance on TAKS. Beginning with ratings released in 2007, append a label of “commended” to campus and district ratings if the campus or district also earns a GPA for at least

50% of the commended indicators on which the campus or district is evaluated. A minimum of three of the five commended indicators must be evaluated; or if only two are evaluated, both must be acknowledged (2 out of 2). Only campuses and districts rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher are eligible to receive this additional label. Campuses and districts evaluated under AEA procedures are not eligible to receive this additional label.

*Rationale:* This use of commended provides an incentive to increase student performance among students achieving well above the *Met Standard* passing level. This change is not implemented until 2007 which follows the recommendation of previous advisory committees and focus groups. Advance notice of this change for 2007 provides the knowledge campuses and districts need to motivate 2006-07 performance in order to achieve this additional accolade.

3. Required Improvement. Continue to use Required Improvement (RI) as defined in the 2005 system for TAKS in 2006 and 2007. Maintain a floor for *Recognized* that is five points below the current year standard. There is no floor for gating up to *Academically Acceptable*. RI is calculated as the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year accountability standard in two years. Prior year percent *Met Standard* will be recalculated at the current year student passing standard so that gain from the prior year to the current year is calculated using comparable performance data for the two years. RI is calculated for each TAKS subject area, for All Students, and each student group evaluated.

*Rationale:* The accountability system is designed to reward either meeting an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard. The use of the five point floor for achieving *Recognized* with RI is an appropriate safeguard for earning this higher rating label.

4. Minimum Size Criteria for 2007 and Beyond. Continue with the minimum size criteria of 30/10%/50 through 2008. Revisit the issue of eliminating the 10%/50 portions of the criteria during the 2007 development cycle, with the first possible use of new size criteria to begin in 2009.

*Rationale:* This recommendation maintains system stability, and does not unduly allow the performance of proportionately small student groups to affect the ratings of large schools or districts.

5. October 2005 and February 2006 Exit-Level Testing. Currently, only the spring testing results for 11<sup>th</sup> grade exit-level testers are included in state accountability. Expand the inclusion of exit-level results to include the October exit level TAKS administrations of grade 11 first time testers, provided the students passed all tests during that administration and they are not represented in the April administration. Allow appeals for inclusion of the February results to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

*Rationale:* This recommendation incorporates the results of more grade 11 students. It also addresses a scholarship program that is available to students who graduate early. Including the October results will not create a disincentive for allowing these accelerated students to test early. Test administration policy should prevent inappropriate testing of 11<sup>th</sup> graders in the fall.

### **Assessments for Students with Disabilities**

1. Use of SDAA II in 2006 and 2007. Continue to use the SDAA II indicator as it was defined in 2005. The SDAA II indicator is a single performance indicator evaluated for all SDAA II tested grades (grades 3-10). The indicator is calculated as the number of tests meeting admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee expectations (summed across grades and subjects) divided by the number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established (summed across grades and subjects). The SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only.

Use the same minimum size criteria (30 tests) as was used in 2005. Include the consideration of PBM indicators to help evaluate SDAA II appeals. Add the required improvement feature, which was last used in 2004 with the SDAA indicator. Use the RI feature to allow a campus or district to gate up

to either *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* if the gain in SDAA II performance is enough to meet the standard in two years. Require a floor of 65% for gating up to *Recognized*.

**Rationale:** The SDAA II indicator treats special education students as a student group on a measure designed for that population while avoiding the disadvantages inherent in using special education as a student group throughout the system; therefore, the SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only.

Given the phase-in recommendation for use of the TAKS-I results beginning in 2008, continued use of the SDAA II in 2006 and 2007 ensures that some assessment results for students with disabilities who do not take the TAKS are included in the state accountability system continuously between 2006 and 2010 while the new assessments are fully phased in.

Since SDAA II is administered for either two or three subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, and Mathematics) depending on the grade tested, and the results are summed across subjects as well as grades, the 30 tests minimum size requirement can represent as few as 10 students at grades 4 and 7 and as few as 15 students at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8-10. The criteria of 10 students for the SDAA II corresponds to the All Students minimum size criteria of 10 students for the dropout and completion rate measures that will be used for 2006 accountability. There are no minimum size requirements for TAKS at the All Students level.

2. Standards for SDAA II. The performance standards for the SDAA II indicator for 2006 and 2007 are set at the same levels as they were in 2005, as shown in the table, below:

	<b>2005 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2006 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007 AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>SDAA II</b>	50 / 70 / 90	50 / 70 / 90	50 / 70 / 90

**Rationale:** Maintaining the standards previously set on this indicator provides stable targets through the life of this testing program.

3. Incorporating TAKS Inclusive (TAKS-I). New assessments are being developed that will replace the SDAA II and the Locally Determined Alternative Assessments (LDAA's) beginning in 2008. The different assessments that are available or will be available for students receiving special education services include the SDAA II, the TAKS-I, the LDAA's, the TAKS Alternate (TAKS-Alt), and the new "2%" assessment.

SDAA II:	for students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, even with allowable accommodations, is not an appropriate assessment. Given at ARD set instructional level, not necessarily grade level. The final SDAA II assessment will be in 2006-07.
TAKS-I:	for students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, even with allowable accommodations, is not an appropriate assessment. Students may only take TAKS-I tests at their enrolled grade level. TAKS-I is initially given at grades and subjects where SDAA II is not. After SDAA II is discontinued, TAKS-I expands to include the SDAA II tested grades and subjects. TAKS-I uses the TAKS met standard and commended student passing standards.
LDAA:	for students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, TAKS-I, and SDAA II are not appropriate. The final LDAA data collections will be in 2006-07.
TAKS-Alt:	intended to replace some LDAA tests beginning in 2007-08.
2% Assessment:	to meet federal guidelines for the proposed 2% policy to assess certain students with disabilities based on modified achievement standards.

TAKS-I results will be reported but not used in the accountability system for two years beginning in 2006. TAKS-I results will be used in the state accountability system for the first time in 2008. This follows the 'report, report, use' mechanism for phasing in new assessment results into the accountability system. This phase-in schedule means that only a portion of the TAKS-I results will be used for accountability in 2008. All TAKS-I grades and subjects will be used beginning in 2010.

*Rationale:* The 'report, report, use' schedule gives more time to districts and campuses to prepare for inclusion of these new results. Since not All Students are tested on all subjects in the current state accountability system, there is no need to wait for all grades/subjects to be tested before the reporting of TAKS-I. Using TAKS-I as early as 2008 ensures that some assessment results for students with disabilities who do not take the TAKS are included in the state accountability system continuously between 2006 and 2010 while the new assessments are fully phased in.

4. Incorporating TAKS Alternative (TAKS-Alt). TAKS-Alt results will be reported but not used in the accountability system for two years beginning in 2008. How the reporting of this indicator in the state accountability system will occur is yet to be determined (separate reporting versus combining with TAKS results). TAKS-ALT results of all grades and subjects tested will be incorporated into the AYP system in 2008 when this assessment is first administered.

*Rationale:* Allowing for two years of reporting on this new indicator will give schools the necessary time to become familiar with this new assessment, which is given to students who are receiving special education services and who are currently tested using Locally Determined Alternative Assessments (LDAAs).

5. Incorporating the 2% Assessment. The 2% test results will be reported but not used in the accountability system for two years beginning in 2008. The 2% assessment results will be used in the state accountability system for the first time in 2010. This follows the 'report, report, use' mechanism for phasing in new assessment results into the accountability system. Results of all grades and subjects tested by the 2% test will be incorporated into the AYP system in 2008 when this assessment is first administered.

*Rationale:* The 'report, report, use' schedule gives the necessary time to schools to become familiar with this new assessment. This will be the last new assessment for students with disabilities introduced and will complete the phase-in of the new assessments for students receiving special education services.

#### **Annual Dropout Rate (Grade 7-8) Indicator**

1. Standards for 2006 and Beyond. Maintain the same standards for 2006 through 2008 that were in place in 2005.

	<b>2006 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2009 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2010 AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Recognized</b>	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Exemplary</b>	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Current State Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition

*Rationale:* The 2005-06 annual dropout rates will be the first calculated using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition. This means 2007 will be the first accountability year to evaluate grade 7-8 annual dropout rates using the new, more rigorous definition. Using the NCES dropout definition in 2007 will affect high schools more significantly than middle schools. Given this

indicator applies to students in grades 7-8 only and the impact is limited to students who return to school after the school-start window, it is recommended that the standards be held at current levels for 2007 and 2008. During the 2008 development cycle when 2005-06 data (the first year of data under NCES definition) is available, standards for 2009 and beyond will be determined.

2. Hold Harmless Provision for 2007. For 2007 only, add a Hold Harmless Provision to the system, such that if the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate is the only indicator causing a district or campus to be *Academically Unacceptable*, then the campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* instead.

*Rationale:* Very small numbers of campuses and districts are evaluated on this indicator due to the very small numbers of grade 7-8 dropouts in the state. However, because the effect of the definitional change is difficult to estimate, do not allow an *Academically Unacceptable* rating to be based solely on this indicator.

3. Required Improvement. In 2006 use the same RI methodology as was in place in 2005. In 2007 the RI feature will be unavailable. In 2008 re-instate the RI feature.

*Rationale:* 2006 is the last year of the TEA dropout definition. In 2007 RI cannot be calculated because the 2005-06 definition will differ from the 2004-05 definition. The lack of the RI feature will coincide with the one year Hold Harmless provision for this indicator. In 2008 there will be two years of comparable data using the NCES dropout definition (2006-07 and 2005-06), therefore RI can be computed. With RI, districts and campuses have a second way to achieve a higher rating, if they can demonstrate enough improvement. This keeps an incentive in the system to focus on improving campus and district dropout rates. Also, with changes to the measure definition, more campuses and districts may need and be able to use this feature in the future.

4. Minimum Size Criteria. Maintain the minimum size criteria established in 2005; namely, for All Students, a minimum of 5 grade 7-8 dropouts, and at least 10 grade 7-8 students. For student groups a minimum of 5 grade 7-8 dropouts is required and the 30/10%/50 rule applies to the total number of grade 7-8 students.

*Rationale:* Very few campuses and districts were affected by this indicator, since it applies to students in grades 7-8 only.

5. Effect of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students displaced due to the hurricanes may have an effect on leaver data collected during the 2005-06 school year that will be used to create dropout rates in the 2007 accountability system. Agency staff will develop specific recommendations for removing the impact of serving students displaced due to the hurricanes from the dropout accountability indicator. The mechanism will take place outside the appeals process. If necessary, a subcommittee of the focus group will be formed to make recommendations on this issue prior to the 2007 development cycle.

*Rationale:* As with the assessment data, districts have been assured that serving hurricane displaced students would not have an adverse effect on accountability ratings should dropout rates be inflated for one year because of difficulties tracking or retaining these students. Because options for accomplishing this require more time to develop and discuss, the formation of a focus group subcommittee is recommended.

### **Completion Rate (Grade 9-12) Indicator**

1. Completion Rate Definition in 2006. The completion rate indicator is calculated as the number of completers expressed as a percent of total students in the class (graduates, continuing students, GED recipients, and dropouts). Beginning with the class of 2005 and the ratings issued in 2006 (students whose cohort entered 9th grade in 2001-02), only graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) will count as high school completers for the

accountability completion rate under standard procedures. GED recipients will continue to count in the definition of a completer under AEA procedures.

*Rationale:* Before the beginning of the 2005 school year districts and campuses were informed that students graduating as the class of 2005 and beyond who receive a GED will not be counted as completers for accountability ratings under standard procedures. The decision to exclude GED recipients was based on the recommendations of the advisory committee, focus group, and commissioner in 2004.

2. Standards for 2006 and Beyond. Hold the completion rate standards constant through 2007. Set standards for 2008 and beyond during the 2007 development cycle.

	<b>2006 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2009 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2010 AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	<b>TBD</b>	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	<b>TBD</b>	TBD	TBD
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	<b>TBD</b>	TBD	TBD
<b>Completion Rate Definition</b>	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Current State Definition	<b>Phase-in NCES definition</b>	<b>Phase-in NCES definition</b>	<b>Phase-in NCES definition</b>	<b>NCES definition</b>

*Rationale:* Because GED recipients are no longer considered completers beginning with the class of 2005, the rigor of the system will increase in 2006, even though standards are not increased.

The 2007 accountability year (class of 2006) is the first year the NCES dropout definition is used in the denominator of the completion rate calculation. Also, because of the definitional change to the denominator, RI cannot be used. Both these factors (the definitional change and the lack of an RI feature) increase the rigor of the completion rate in 2007.

If necessary, a focus group subcommittee will be formed to address completion rate issues due to the complexities of predicting completion rate values under the NCES definition.

3. Required Improvement. In 2006 use RI for the completion rate indicator as it was defined in 2005. This is possible because the class of 2005 and class of 2004 completion rates are comparably defined. Use Completion Rate I (without GED recipients) for both years. In 2007 suspend the use of RI because the class of 2006 and class of 2005 do not use the same definition. The class of 2006 is the first cohort impacted by the NCES dropout definition.
4. Minimum Size Criteria. Maintain the minimum size criteria previously established; namely, at least five dropouts and at least 10 students in the grade 9-12 class; and for student groups at least five dropouts and 30/10%/50 in the class.

*Rationale:* Very few campuses and districts were affected by this indicator.

5. Use of District Rate. Maintain previous methodology for using the district's completion rate when the campus is eligible to be evaluated on the indicator but has no completion rate of its own.

*Rationale:* Issues with the use of the district rate can continue to be handled through the appeals process. This feature appears to be working as intended.

6. Effect of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students displaced due to the hurricanes may have an effect on leaver data collected during the 2005-06 school year that will be used to create completion rates in the 2007 accountability system. Agency staff will develop specific recommendations for taking into

account the impact of serving students displaced due to the hurricanes from the completion accountability indicator. The mechanism will take place outside the appeals process. If necessary, a subcommittee of the focus group should be formed to make recommendations on this issue prior to the 2007 development cycle.

*Rationale:* As with the assessment data, districts have been assured that serving hurricane displaced students would not have an adverse effect on accountability ratings should completion rates be depressed because of difficulties tracking or retaining these students. Because additional time is needed to address options for accomplishing this, the formation of a subcommittee of the focus group is recommended.

## Ratings Processes

1. AECs rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable and district ratings. Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable will NOT prevent a district rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

*Rationale:* The AEA system is working effectively and a campus rating of AEA: Academically Unacceptable creates community concern without the need for additional repercussions. Often these AECs are quite small and (by definition) operating under non-standard circumstances. It would not be appropriate for the district's rating to be controlled by only AEA campus performance. Allowing AEA campus ratings to limit district ratings could create the unintended consequence of inhibiting appropriate use of these facilities to meet student needs. Districts should not be inhibited from providing alternative education options for students.

2. Underreported Students Data Quality Indicator. Districts that fail to meet accountability standards on the annual underreported students indicator will be investigated and will be prevented from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. Subsequent investigation may prevent a district from being rated *Academically Acceptable*. In addition, data quality will be a consideration when analyzing district and campus completion rate and annual dropout rate appeals. The Person Identification Database (PID) error rate will continue to be reported and used to monitor the quality of district PEIMS data submissions. Longitudinal measures of data quality will be explored and future focus groups will consider using a new longitudinal indicator to replace the current underreported indicator; or, the option of adding this indicator to the Performance-Based Monitoring Data Integrity System.

*Standards:* Increase the rigor of the underreported students standard each year through the 2008 accountability ratings. For example, for 2005 any district that had more than **100** underreported students or greater than **5.0%** underreported students could not be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. See the table below for the recommended standards for 2006 through 2008.

Accountability Year	Underreported students data year	Underreported students cannot exceed:	
		Number	Percent
2006	2004-05	100	<b>2.0</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	100	<b>1.5</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
2010	2008-09	TBD	TBD

*Rationale:* These standards were previously announced, so districts should be prepared for these more stringent criteria. Submission of accurate data is a district responsibility.

3. Exceptions Provision. Continue to use the Exceptions Provision in 2006 as it was used in 2005. As planned, do not allow a campus or district to reuse an exception for the same measure if it was applied in 2005.

*Rationale:* Because of the safeguard that the same exception cannot be used for two consecutive years, there will be a natural limit to the use of this provision as the accountability system ages. Because urban districts are evaluated on so many more measures on average, a mechanism that acknowledges more than 16 measures evaluated is needed. The accountability system has not yet stabilized, as is evident by the addition of a number of new state assessments for students with disabilities scheduled to be implemented through 2008.

## **Hurricanes Katrina and Rita**

1. Serving Displaced Students. The assessment results of students displaced due to either Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita will be removed from the accountability data as stated in the October 12, 2005 letter from the commissioner. The Katrina-Rita Indicator (KRI) code that is being collected on the TAKS and SDAA II answer documents will be used to determine which scores to exclude. System safeguards will be considered such as comparing the KRI code to the campus of last attendance in 2005.

*Rationale:* This recommendation fairly restricts the attribution of ratings to those students impacted by the two hurricanes. The normal accountability subset rules remain intact to ensure comparable longitudinal data reporting and ratings.

2. Districts/Campuses Directly Affected by Hurricane Rita. Ratings will be evaluated differently for districts that were directly impacted by Hurricane Rita and were unable to open for extended periods of time. Districts directly impacted by Hurricane Rita are defined to be:
  - ◆ Districts that are located in a county designated by FEMA as a disaster area that qualifies for public assistance due to Hurricane Rita; **and**,
  - ◆ Districts that were closed for ten or more instructional days between September 21, 2005 and November 3, 2005.

If a district is identified, all of its campuses are also identified.

For identified districts and campuses, the accountability system will generate ratings using available data. If the 2006 ratings are not *Academically Unacceptable* and are equivalent to or better than the rating received in 2005, TEA will issue the new system-generated rating on August 1. For all others (meaning the 2006 rating is either *Academically Unacceptable* or lower than the rating received in 2005), TEA will issue a rating of *Not Rated: Other* on August 1. Districts may appeal the *Not Rated: Other* label and request the assignment of the system-generated rating if they wish. For example, a campus in an identified district rated *Exemplary* in 2005 with a system-generated rating of *Recognized* in 2006 would be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. The district may appeal to have the *Not Rated: Other* label for the campus changed to *Recognized*. Districts receiving the *Not Rated: Other* ratings under this provision are still subject to the same system safeguards as all other rated districts.

Any district/campus that was not identified may still appeal under the regular appeals process. Detailed information about the 2006 appeals process will be provided in the *2006 Accountability Manual*.

For purposes of counting consecutive years of ratings, 2005 and 2007 will be considered consecutive for districts or campuses receiving a *Not Rated: Other* label in 2006 due to hurricane-related issues.

*Rationale:* This decision addresses the significant impact on instruction caused by this event. By automatically issuing most ratings, the number of appeals that have to be submitted and/or processed is minimized. Districts and campuses that overcame the adversity and continued to improve or maintain performance are credited with a rating.

Although there is a risk of not capturing some districts and campuses that would appropriately be rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2006, evaluating 2005 and 2007 as consecutive years will reduce this risk.

Normally, the appeals process would be used to appropriately rate districts and campuses adversely affected by natural disasters. Requiring a minimum loss of ten instructional days allows for an automatic treatment of ratings outside the appeals process only when the event is extraordinary and widespread.

### **Gold Performance Acknowledgment System**

1. 2006 Standards. Maintain the 2005 standards for all GPA indicators in 2006, except for Recommended High School Program / Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP). The standard for this indicator will increase by 10 percentage points, to 70.0% in 2006.

*Rationale:* The current standards are quite stringent for a vast majority of districts and campuses. The RHSP/DAP standard is increased because the recommended high school program becomes the default curriculum for students entering ninth grade beginning in the 2004-05 school year (19 Texas Administrative Code §74.51, 2004).

2. Standards for 2007 and Beyond. Keep the 2006 standards steady from 2007 to 2010 for the following indicators: Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate results, attendance rate, and comparable improvement on Reading and Mathematics.

For advanced/dual enrollment course completion, the acknowledgment standard will increase to 30.0% in 2009.

For commended performance, increase the standard for each subject by 5 percentage points every other year beginning in 2007, resulting in an increase to 30% for 2009 and 2010.

For RHSP/DAP, increase the standard to 80.0% in 2007 and 2008, and to 85.0% in 2009 and 2010.

Keep the SAT/ACT indicator in the GPA system and maintain the current standard through 2008 (i.e., 70.0% for participation and 40.0% for performance) and use only the Mathematics and Critical Reading scores on the new SAT. The standard for the SAT/ACT indicator is yet to be determined for 2009 and 2010.

The standard for the Texas Success Initiative in English Language Arts and Mathematics will remain at 50% in 2007 and increase by 5 percentage points each year thereafter until 2010.

### **Progress Measure for English Language Learners (ELL)**

1. ELL Progress Measure Definition. Progress is defined as either meeting a student proficiency standard or demonstrating growth based on two years of test results on RPTE (scoring one level higher than the previous year). The ELL Progress measure will report the percentage of current and monitored LEP students who meet any of the following three criteria:

- 1) the student meets the passing standard on the TAKS English Reading/ELA test,
- 2) the student meets the proficiency level on the RPTE based on years in U.S. schools for first-time RPTE testers, or
- 3) the student shows progress on the RPTE from the prior year.

Results from the TAKS Spanish tests are not included.

Use of the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) Texas Observation Protocols (TOP) results will not be included.

RPTE II results (first administered in spring 2008) will be included in the 2008 ELL measure (for both the proficiency and progress calculations).

2. The ELL measure will be reported for two years (2005-06 and 2006-07) before being used for the first time in the 2008 accountability year. Standards will be set during the 2007 accountability cycle (using 2006 results).

*Rationale:* The decision to define the ELL progress measure this way follows the 2004 focus group recommendation that this measure include students who are steadily progressing toward English in academic settings. Reporting the new measure for two years and setting standards during the 2007 development cycle will provide notification of standards to districts prior to the start of the 2007-08 school year. It is anticipated that proficiency levels set on the RPTE II will be comparable to the proficiency levels for the current RTPE test which will allow for use of the RPTE II test results in the first year of testing. Once the RPTE II is developed and comparability of RPTE to RPTE II is determined, use of the ELL measure in state accountability may be delayed until 2008-09 if comparability is an issue.

### **College Readiness Indicators**

On December 16, 2005, the Governor issued executive order RP53 which states that the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) shall work together to create a system of college readiness indicators. The executive order RP53 does not specify the potential use of the new college readiness indicators.

TEA and THECB, working together through the P-16 council, have recently begun discussions concerning new college readiness indicators, but have not yet reached consensus on the definition of "college readiness." Once the term college readiness is defined, an indicator or indicators can be defined and a system of standards and criteria for evaluation of these indicator(s) can be developed.